

# STRUGGLING MIDDLE SCHOOL READERS: SUCCESSFUL, ACCELERATING INTERVENTION

DR. ROSEMARY PAPALEWIS

*California State University, Sacramento*

The primary focus of this study was to evaluate the impact of an intervention reading program on students repeating the 8th grade in a large urban inner city school district. Two years of Reading and Language Art scores ( $n=537$ ) were analyzed (NCE scores) across various demographic variables (attendance, English language proficiency, and race/ethnicity/gender). A group of students, not participating in any special intervention, matched on pretest means, gender, ethnicity and language proficiency, was chosen for comparison purposes. Overall, the participants made significant gains of over three (3) normal curve equivalents in Reading and almost two (2) normal curve equivalents in Language Arts (SAT-9), while the comparison group scored significantly lower (on the post test).

## **Purpose of the Study**

Poor reading skills in children are the prevalent indicator of dismal public school practices. Poor readers are the result of many factors. Blame for producing poor readers is sometimes leveled on variables school's have little or no impact on – poverty, English as a second language, poor attendance, etc. Research (Moats, June, 1999; Papalewis, March, 2002) suggests that teachers and principals, and the curriculum they choose, tied to strong teacher professional development, can and do make a difference. What is known is that if a student cannot read by the 8th grade, the likelihood of dropping out of school is almost a given. By today's standards without a high school diploma one cannot enter military service, or work in many entry level service-oriented jobs.

The primary focus of this study was to evaluate the impact of an intervention reading program on students repeating the 8th grade in a large urban inner city school district. The No Child Left Behind Act of

2001, holds schools accountable for the improvement of all students measured through academic achievement indicators. The importance of instructional efficacy is discussed in Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998) and is generally addressed in studies of basal reading programs conducted by Stein (1993) and Stein, Johnson & Gutlohn (Sept-Oct, 1999). Although no operational definition of instructional efficacy in early reading instruction has been tested to date, proposed elements of the concept include: 1) A pedagogically well-designed, developmental instructional plan that extends across days and weeks; 2) A method of monitoring progress to allow for adjustment of the plan, as needed; 3) Manageable, effective, classroom-friendly instructional guidance (Snow, et al., 1998); 4) Clear, distinguished key, and optional activities (Snow, et al., 1998); 5) High percentage of potential accuracy in student readers, as well as, in supplementary support materials (Stein, et.al., 1999);

and, 6) Sufficient emphasis on key instructional categories (Stein, 1993).

It is clear that when schools turn from remediation to intervention strategies, poor readers accelerate their growth more quickly. Intervention strategies reflect a powerful philosophy shift in ensuring school practices are meant for all students, especially older poor readers. The earlier the intervention strategies, primary grades, the better it is to eliminate low performing readers. Torgesen & Burgess (1998) support evidence that only one child in eight who experiences serious reading difficulties at the end of first grade ever attains reading skills within the average range. Neal & Kelly (2002) note, that in the past, extra help for struggling upper grade readers was considered remediation. They characterize this as the school's "wait and let fail" approach to poor readers—only after students demonstrate a two year discrepancy to grade level skills, will supplemental remedial instruction be sought. Remedial instruction is characterized by students doing isolated worksheet/work package activities, mostly monitored by paraprofessionals or volunteers.

Neal & Kelly (2002) draw an important distinction between intervention and remediation, by identifying six characteristics of successful intervention programs that accelerate reading skills in older students: 1) Consider individual student needs; 2) Implement an apprenticeship model of teaching and learning; 3) Select appropriate materials; 4) Establish a focus on accelerative instruction; 5) Consider the role of fluent responding; and, 6) Provide for affirmation of success.

Torgesen (Spring/Summer, 1998), states that once reading instruction begins, the best predictor of future reading growth is current reading achievement, and the most critical indicators of good progress in learning to read during the early elementary period are measures of word reading skill (p.6). Adequate monitoring of the growth of word reading ability should include out-of-context measures of word reading ability, phonetic decoding ability, (as measured by the ability to read non-words), and word reading fluency (p.8). In *Teaching Children to Read* (National Reading Panel, 2000) fluency is one of the several critical factors necessary for reading comprehension. Reading practice is an important component to fluency, especially guided repeated oral practice and independent silent reading. The NPR notes three skills required for reading comprehension skills: vocabulary development; intentional and thoughtful interaction between the reader and the text; and, the preparation of teachers.

Current researchers (Lovett, Lacerensa, Borden, Frijters, Seteinbach, & DePalma, 2000; Torgesen, Alexander, Wagner, Rashotte, Voeller, Conway, & Rose, 2001) indicate that to increase reading skills in older children with serious reading problems requires intensive paced reading with explicit decoding emphasis than are typically observed in public school intervention programs. Reading difficulty stem from many avenues among older readers, such as: 1) poor word identification; 2) guessing on words based on the context; 3) decoding unfamiliar words; and 4) lack of fluent word recognition. Also, reading comprehension tends to move up to a level

that is consistent with their general verbal skills (Torgesen, Rashotte, Alexander, & MacPhee, 2002).

Torgesen, et.al. (2002) feel explicit instruction in phonemic decoding skills to increase older student's sight word vocabulary are generally ineffective in producing lasting reading improvement with older children who have serious reading difficulties. Additionally, children from low socioeconomic homes may also suffer from lower verbal skills and that language comprehension difficulties result from restricted vocabulary and background knowledge. Increasing vocabulary development through focused intervention strategies and methods can be as powerful as comprehension strategies. We know poor readers are more likely to come from homes of poverty and where English is a second language.

What role do schools play? Snow, Burns & Griffin (1998) found that poor readers in elementary school going to middle school are poor readers because of inadequate instruction in primary grades. Lyon, Fletcher, Shaywitz, Shaywitz, Torgesen, Wood, Schulte, and Olson (2001), state there is no evidence that children who are poor readers primarily because of limited cognitive abilities and those whose lack of reading skill can be attributed primarily to poor instruction actually require different kinds of remedial instruction. Late intervention (Neal & Kelly, 2002) takes a proactive, catch-up stance toward the specific learning needs of students. The essential ingredient for intervention programs is the rigor of delivering intervention instruction for increased acceleration to attain function levels of their peers.

Reading intervention research provides evidence most children with remedial problems 1) have poor skilled word identification; 2) rely on guessing the word based on context; and, 3) phonemic decoding of unfamiliar words and limited fluency (Wagner, Torgesen, Rashotte, Hecht, Barker, Burgess, Donahue, & Garon, 1997).

### Methods and Procedures

In the 2000-2001 academic year, designated 8th grade students received specialized instruction to improve their reading skills. Under the auspices of the Intensive Academic Support Program (IAS), the READ 180 Program from SCHOLASTIC, INC., was implemented.

READ 180 is a reading intervention program created as a result of more than ten years of research by experts at Vanderbilt University. Through a collaborative research effort between Vanderbilt and the Orange County Public School System in Florida, the READ 180 pilot was used with more than 10,000 students between 1994 and 1999. Research on the pilot project indicated students participating in the Orange County research program experienced quantifiable improvement in the areas of reading achievement, especially positive attitudes and behaviors, and overall higher school achievement (Papalewis, January, 2002).

READ 180 is designed to support teachers in their efforts to improve reading achievement for students reading below grade level in the upper elementary and middle grades. READ 180 utilizes an intensive reading intervention approach to:

- Deliver individualized, adjusted reading instruction to improve students'

reading skills;

- Provide practice and application of skills in multiple contexts to increase reading achievement, and;
- Support and motivate students as they progress toward becoming lifelong readers and learners.

READ 180 combines research-based reading practices with the effective use of technology, offering students an opportunity to achieve reading success through a combination of instructional, modeled, and independent reading components. The program incorporates instructional decision-making procedures and state of the art instructional materials to ensure each student's individual needs are addressed and for each to attain maximum achievement.

This model combines the following elements:

- 90-minute daily class periods;
- Reduced class size of 15 students per class;
- Students engaged in daily instructional reading using READ 180 software;
- Students receive daily modeled or independent reading practice;
- Students participate daily through individual or small-group instruction, and;
- Distinct classroom areas are designated for each type of instructional activity:
  - A computer area with 5 computers for the READ 180 instructional software;
  - A comfortable reading area with cassette players and headphones for listening to the READ 180 audio-books, and;
  - A worktable for teacher directed

small-group instruction.

The READ 180 approach begins with 20 minutes of whole-class literacy instruction in which the teacher and students engage in shared reading, read aloud, or do direct instruction skill lessons. Next, the students are split into three groups and each group participates in three 20-minute rotations. During each of the three rotations the teacher works directly with one small group of students, while the remaining two groups work independently at the computer or reading stations. After the three rotations, the instruction ends with a 10-minute wrap-up for students to reflect on their daily performance.

To assist the teacher in developing lesson plans and monitoring student progress, The READ 180 instructional components include materials: Teacher's Guides, and Reading Strategies, and Resource books for comprehension and writing support. The Scholastic Management Suite software provides detailed progress reports allowing teachers to identify skills mastered and areas for improvement. The Scholastic Reading Inventory software provides an assessment of overall reading achievement and uses the Lexile Framework to facilitate assignment of program materials by matching student levels to text materials.

#### *Student Selection and Teacher Training*

For this study, students from a large urban school district were selected for the program based on SAT-9 scores, report cards, and teacher recommendation. Two specific criteria were used by the schools for the 8th graders designated as IAS stu-

dents: A grade of D or F in 8th grade English, and a non-passing grade on the district writing performance test. Most of the IAS students were repeating the 8th grade. These 8th grade students began receiving the READ 180 program during the 2000-2001 school year. The one common denominator was the student as a struggling reader.

During the 2000-2001 implementation year Scholastic provided consultant training support for READ 180 teachers. These sessions started in May 2000 and continued through May 2001 and usually consisted of one half day or one whole day programs. Over 150 teachers received some level of training. Topics of the training included:

- What Is READ 180 And How Does It Work?
- The First Two Weeks Of School
- Placement And Pacing
- Whole Class Instruction
- Instructional Reading
- Small Group Instruction
- Modeled And Independent Reading
- Whole Class Wrap-Up

#### *Content Analysis of Classroom Observations*

In order to verify implementation of the READ 180 curriculum, a trained observer visited twenty-five IAS eighth grade classrooms in twenty-one middle schools in a large urban school district. The one hour visitations occurred May through June 2001. The READ 180 Observer Evaluation Forms were used. Almost all of the classes were 90-minute class periods where whole group instruction was observed. All of the classes were 15-20 students in size.

Core class activities were observed in nineteen of the classrooms, as was the class-ending wrap up activity. In general there was evidence that almost all of the classes observed modeled reading using audio-books, independent reading using leveled literature, video segments, and student participation in direct instruction-writing lessons. And for over half of the classrooms observed, the READ 180 program was operating well. In several classrooms, use of student data to improve instruction needed attention and monitoring by teachers.

### **Findings**

#### *Baseline Participant Data*

For the students who began receiving the READ 180 program in September of 2000, data were collected for the spring 1999 testing period and the Spring 2000 testing period (n=622). Tables 1 and 2 present the results of that testing in general, across gender, language classification, and ethnic group.

Table 1 displays the Reading and Language Arts NCEs (Normal Curve Equivalent) scores for the READ 180 participants for the 1999-2000 and the previous year (1998-1999). Scores for these two years serve as baseline data. As shown, both years' NCEs scores in Reading and Language Arts are approximately equal in the low 30's. A repeated measures analysis showed no significant difference in NCEs for either content area.

Further analysis for the two years in Reading and Language Arts indicate a degree of variability in the scores. In both

Table 1  
Reading and Language Arts NCEs Baseline  
N = 622

READ 180	1998-1999			1999-2000			
	NCE		Percentile	NCE		Percentile	**District
	Mean	(S)	Mean*	Mean	(S)	Mean*	Percentile
Reading	31.48	(21.03)	19	31.02	(19.53)	18	32
Language Arts	32.04	(21.19)	20	32.39	(21.46)	20	36

\*\*Source: <http://data.cac.ca.gov/>

\* Converted from Mean NCEs

areas for the years, approximately 35% of the students score between 18 and 35 NCEs. Approximately 30% score lower than 18 and 35% score higher than 35. For 1999-2000, the READ 180 students' percentile average was 18, below the district average for 8th graders of 32. In Language Arts, the READ 180 student percentile average was 20, also below the district average percentile of 36. Clearly, the READ 180 participants were those students needing additional academic intervention.

Table 2 displays the data regarding Reading and Language Arts NCEs across the demographic variables. The variation across group means by ethnicity is very apparent. For example, in Reading for 1999-2000, Hispanic participants (79% of the group) scored at a mean of 27.60. In contrast, for the three small groups of White, Asian and Filipino students in Read-

ing for the same year, the mean exceeded 50.00 NCEs. Students identified as African-American scored at 40.87 NCEs.

As would be expected, students identified as limited English proficient scored the lowest of all language groups in Reading for 1999-2000 (21.10 NCEs).

Not shown in Table 2 are the percentile scores for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. In Reading, LEP READ 180 students had a percentile mean of 9 compared to the district 8th grade LEP average of 13. In Language Arts, READ 180 students' converted mean percentile was 9 compared to 15, the district average. Again, these results were evidence of the need for additional learning opportunities for the selected students.

#### *Final Participant Data*

In the spring of 2001, all READ 180

Table 2  
Reading and Language Art Performance Baseline  
By Demographic Variables

READ 180		READING NCEs				LANGUAGE NCEs			
		1998-1999		1999-2000		1998-1999		1999-2000	
ETHNICITY	N	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)
Asian	16	51.94	(19.52)	50.41	(18.20)	55.74	(22.85)	61.48	(22.17)
African-American	85	43.03	(21.39)	40.87	(22.40)	43.23	(22.79)	41.28	(22.77)
Hispanic	492	27.79	(19.39)	27.60	(17.52)	28.05	(18.82)	29.01	(19.87)
White	18	45.76	(18.39)	50.05	(14.86)	51.63	(20.27)	41.68	(14.13)
Filipino	10	45.76	(19.59)	50.75	(23.04)	60.71	(20.86)	58.98	(18.53)
*Pacific Islander	1								
TOTAL	622	31.48	(21.03)	31.02	(19.53)	32.04	(21.19)	32.39	(21.46)
GENDER									
Male	381	30.32	(20.15)	28.93	(19.07)	29.71	(19.93)	30.57	(20.33)
Female	241	33.32	(22.27)	34.31	(19.82)	35.72	(22.60)	35.28	(22.87)
TOTAL	622	31.48	(21.03)	31.02	(19.53)	32.04	(21.19)	32.39	(21.46)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE Classification									
**LEP	272	22.03	(16.89)	21.10	(14.89)	19.98	(12.75)	22.33	(16.08)
***RFEP	162	35.70	(20.50)	37.90	(17.92)	40.00	(21.04)	40.86	(21.01)
****IFEP	29	47.71	(20.71)	42.62	(21.09)	47.00	(20.14)	44.58	(23.35)
NONE LISTED	159	40.38	(21.09)	38.85	(21.15)	41.83	(22.61)	38.76	(22.44)
TOTAL	622	31.48	(21.03)	31.02	(19.53)	32.04	(21.19)	32.39	(21.46)

\*To maintain confidentiality categories with less than five students are not reported

\*\*LEP = Limited English Proficient

\*\*\*RFEP = Reclassified Fluent English Proficient

\*\*\*\*IFEP = Identified Fluent English Proficient

participants were tested. In October of 2001 matched scores (1999-00 and 2000-01) were reported for 537 participants. This indicates that some students left the IAS program or did not have both 1999-00 and 2000-01 scores. As well, while the data presented in Tables 1 and 2 are essentially the same students, they are not matched with the 537 participants who appear in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Table 3 presents attendance and absence data across the various demographic variables for READ 180 students. The average days attended for READ 180 students were 147 (approximately 82% of the 180 days of the school year). The variability within and across ethnic and language groups was extremely large indicating that some of the students attended school less than 60% of the days available.

Table 4 presents the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 matched scores for READ 180 participants. *For Reading, READ 180 students gained approximately 3 NCEs from one year to the next (significant gain  $p < .05$ ). As well, in Language Arts, READ 180 students gained approximately 2 NCEs (also a significant gain,  $p < .05$ ). District percentile ranks remained approximately equal from 2000 (Table 1) to 2001 (Table 4) at 33 in Reading and 36 in Language Arts. The READ 180 students however, gained four percentile ranks in Reading and three percentile ranks in Language Arts.*

Table 5 presents the Reading and Language Arts NCEs categorized by ethnicity, gender, and language classification. Again, the means across ethnic groups and English Language classification vary greatly for both Reading and Language Arts.

Table 6 depicts the comparison group means (1999-2001) in Reading and Language Arts as approximately equal to the READ 180 1999-2000 means. [Note: The comparison group was selected from all other non-IAS 8th graders from the same district. Selection of the comparison group was based on similar 1999-00 test scores with approximately the same percentages of gender, ethnicity, and language group as the READ 180 students.

As shown, the comparison group students lost ground (NCEs) in both Reading (32.44 to 25.78) and Language Arts (33.10 to 30.44) from 1999-2000 to 2000-2001. This finding is not surprising since these students had identical low reading scores compared to the READ 180 students without the benefit of the READ 180 intensive program. *In comparison READ 180 students made significant gains in both areas. An independent 't' test between the READ 180 students and comparison students for 2000-01 showed significant differences NCEs in both Reading and Language Arts.*

In summary, READ 180 students significantly improved in Reading and Language Arts from pre (1999-00) to post (2000-01) while the comparison group students lost ground. As a result, for 2000-01 READ 180 students were significantly higher than the comparison group students who started at the same level in May, 1999-00.

Overall, the READ 180 participants made significant gains of over three (3) normal curve equivalents in Reading and almost two (2) normal curve equivalents in Language Arts (SAT-9). A group of students, not participating in any special intervention, matched on pretest means,

Table 3  
Demographic Variables and Attendance *Final*

READ 180			Days Attended*		Excused Absences*		Non-Excused Absences*	
ETHNICITY	N	%	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)
Asian	15	3%	172	(20)	5	(13)	1	(04)
African-American	75	14%	150	(40)	9	(11)	7	(10)
Hispanic	421	78%	145	(38)	14	(13)	7	(11)
White	15	3%	157	(22)	15	(16)	7	(09)
Filipino	9	2%	160	(38)	06	(07)	3	(05)
Pacific Islander**	2	<1%						
TOTAL	537		147	(38)	12	(13)	7	(11)
GENDER								
Male	329	61%	146	(37)	12	(13)	7	(10)
Female	208	39%	147	(39)	13	(14)	7	(12)
TOTAL	537		147	(38)	13	(13)	7	(11)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE Classification								
LEP	225	42%	142	(37)	15	(14)	8	(12)
RFEP	143	27%	143	(34)	11	(13)	5	(08)
IFEP	24	4%	147	(34)	14	(12)	7	(09)
None Listed	145	27%	145	(42)	12	(12)	8	(12)
TOTAL	537		147	(38)	13	(13)	7	(11)
*Rounded								

\*\*To maintain confidentiality categories with less than five students are not reported

Table 4  
Reading and Language Arts NCEs *Final*  
N = 537

READ 180	1999-2000			2000-2001			
	NCEs		Percentile	NCEs		Percentile	**District
	Mean	(S)	Mean	Mean	(S)	Mean	Percentile
Reading	32.10	(17.9)	20	35.24**	(19.1)	24	33
Language Arts	33.29	(21.8)	21	35.08**	(21.1)	24	36

Source For District Percentile: <http://data.cae.ca.gov/>

\* Converted from Mean NCEs

\*\*Correlated 't' test,  $p < .05$

gender, ethnicity and language proficiency, was chosen for comparison purposes. Not only did the READ 180 participants score significantly higher than the comparison group, the comparison group lost ground from pre (May 2000) to post (May 2001).

Detailed analysis of the READ 180 group revealed that the participants were primarily identified as Hispanic (78%) with 42% noted as limited English proficient (LEP) and 27% who had been recently reclassified from LEP. These gains of these students were essentially identical to the entire READ 180 participants. Clearly, the READ 180 strategies are effective for English language learners.

### Implications

In this study, READ 180 findings indicate that quantifiable improvement occurred in the reading achievement of participating students. Results of the data analysis indicated that READ 180 participants made gains in Reading and Language Arts for the year in the program and were significantly higher than an equivalent group of students who did not participate in the program (Papalewis, March, 2002).

Today's public schools are driven by standards and assessment measures meant to cure the ills perceived by anxious elected officials and parents. The Bush administration (The No Child Left Behind, 2001), expects students, especially those of color, to be academically tracked for both effective texts and materials and

Table 5  
Reading and Language Arts Performance Final  
By Demographic Variables

READ 180		READING NCEs				LANGUAGE NCEs			
		1999-2000		2000-2001		1999-2000		2000-2001	
ETHNICITY	N	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)
Asian	15	54.38	(17.8)	57.14	(27.6)	62.21	(22.8)	51.47	(32.1)
African-American	75	36.85	(20.5)	39.61	(23.9)	42.64	(22.4)	41.78	(29.9)
Hispanic	421	29.75	(15.9)	32.93	(16.1)	29.62	(20.1)	32.70	(19.2)
White	15	44.22	(23.0)	46.19	(29.9)	43.58	(14.67)	44.38	(25.4)
Filipino	9	49.42	(26.4)	54.97	(21.9)	61.56	(17.7)	51.86	(30.6)
*Pacific Islander	2								
TOTAL	537	32.10	(17.9)	35.24	(19.1)	33.29	(21.8)	35.08	(21.1)
GENDER									
Male	329	30.57	(17.5)	34.82	(17.9)	31.19	(20.6)	33.77	(20.0)
Female	208	34.55	(18.4)	35.90	(20.9)	36.59	(23.2)	37.14	(22.7)
TOTAL	537	32.10	(17.9)	35.24	(19.1)	33.29	(21.8)	35.08	(21.1)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE Classification									
LEP	225	25.36	(11.4)	28.37	(11.36)	23.14	(15.7)	25.07	(14.2)
RFEP	143	37.87	(18.0)	40.76	(19.92)	41.45	(22.1)	43.96	(20.7)
IFEP	24	37.83	(27.7)	43.70	(22.22)	44.58	(25.5)	42.73	(27.6)
NONE LISTED	145	35.95	(20.8)	39.08	(23.5)	39.12	(22.7)	40.63	(23.0)
TOTAL	537	32.10	(17.9)	35.24	(19.11)	33.29	(21.8)	35.08	(21.1)

\*To maintain confidentiality categories with less than five students are not reported

Table 6  
Reading and Language Arts NCES Final  
READ 180 Students and Comparison Group Students

		READING NCES				LANGUAGE ARTS NCES			
		1999-2000		2000-2001		1999-2000		2000-2001	
	N	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)	Mean	(S)
READ 180	537	32.10*	17.9	35.24*#	19.1	33.29*	21.8	35.08*#	21.1
Comparison Group	536	32.44	16.3	25.78#	14.3	33.10	17.8	30.44#	18.1

\* Correlated t test,  $p < .05$ , READ 180 1999-00 v. 2000-01

#Independent t test, READ 180 v. Comparison Group 2000-01 Scores,  $p < .05$

teacher professional training. The READ 180 program's effectiveness with urban school 8th graders (mostly grade repeaters and almost half limited English language speakers), is significant. Intervention programs are overdue in public schools, especially for urban, low socio-economic schools with older students that need help by credentialed teachers to accelerate their reading skills.

The significant growth in reading for these students lends further credence to intervention research (Lovett, et. al., 2000; Rashotte, MacPhee & Torgesen, 2001; Torgesen, et.al., 2001) that implies it is possible to accelerate the development of reading skills in older students with poor reading abilities, at a quicker pace than

typically observed in public schools. READ 180 as designed and found in this study is an intensive and accelerative reading program for older poor reading students.

Older students who read poorly and are from low socioeconomic or minority status not only have reading difficulty in fluency, but with general verbal skills. Snow, et.al., (1998) stated that many children leave elementary school as poor readers because they did not receive adequate instruction. Compounded with second language backgrounds, the reading growth for the students in this study were quite remarkable. This research suggests that READ 180 provides strong teacher professional development and on-

going support (Neal & Kelly, 2002), which lack of is found in the criticism of public school practices with poor readers (Torgesen, et.al., 2001).

In addition to an emphasis on accountability, the NCLB 2001 Act promotes reading programs that are scientifically based, matching well-trained teachers with necessary tools utilizing sound instructional strategies. Results from this study show that the intervention program was particularly effective with students whose native language is other than English (ELL students). In addition to the NCLB (2001) noted components of phonetic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension, the READ 180 strategies (Papalewis, April, 2002) for students included:

Background information to build mental models for the text,  
Text captioning to allow students to read along with the fluency modeled,  
Phonological/morphological structure of the English language;  
Literature and expository materials reflect cultural diversity;  
Decoding tips with modeled practice; and,  
Opportunities for reading of connected text.

For ELL teachers, READ 180 strategies are particularly applicable. In *Leadership on Purpose: Promising Practices for African American and Hispanic Students* (2002), Papalewis and Fortune found that a key component of high achieving schools with large percentages of

Hispanic students is professional teacher development tied specifically to the English language learner.

### References

- Lovett, M.W., Lacerensa, L., Borden, S.L., Frijters, J.C., Seteimbach, K.A., & DePalma, M. (2000). Components of effective remediation for developmental reading disabilities: Combining phonological and strategy-based instruction to improve outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 263-283.
- Lyon, G.R., Fletcher, J.M., Shaywitz, S.E., Shaywitz, B.A., Torgesen, J.K., Wood, F.B., Schulte, A. & Olson, R. (2001). Rethinking learning disabilities. In C.E. Finn, A.J. Rotherham & C.R. Hokanson, Jr. (Eds.). *Rethinking special education for a new century*, 213-232. New York: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Moats, L.C. (June, 1999). *Teaching reading is rocket science. What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: Report from the national reading panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Available Online: [www.nationalreadingpanel.org/Publications/summary.htm](http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/Publications/summary.htm)
- Neal, J.C. & Kelly, P.R. (April-June, 2002). Delivering the promise of academic success through late intervention. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 18, 2, 101-117.
- Papalewis, R. (April, 2002). *English Language Development and READ 180 Intervention*. A policy paper written for F. Alexander, New York City: SCHOLASTIC, INC.
- Papalewis, R. (March, 2002). *Results and validation: The Los Angeles Unified R180 study*. A presentation made at the Scholastic Intervention Convention, San Francisco, California.
- Papalewis, R. (January, 2002). *A study of the intensive academic support program and READ 180 in the Los Angeles Unified School District*. Independent consultant hired by Scholastic, Inc. for program evaluation. Sacramento, CA: [rpapalewis@csus.edu](mailto:rpapalewis@csus.edu)

- Papalewis, R. & Fortune, R. (2002). Leadership on purpose: Promising practices for African American and Hispanic students. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rashotte, C.A., MacPhee, K., & Torgesen, J.K. (2001). The effectiveness of a group reading instruction program with poor readers in multiple grades. Learning Disability Quarterly, 15, 135-149.
- Snow, C., Burns, S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Stein, M. (1993). The beginning reading instruction study. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Stein, M., Johnson, B., & Gutlohn, L. (Sept-Oct, 1999). Analyzing beginning reading programs: The relationship between decoding instruction and text. Remedial and Special Education, 20, 5, 275-287.
- The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Available Online: [www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/](http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/)
- Torgesen, J.K. (Spring/Summer 1998). Catch them before they fall: Identification and assessment to preventing reading failure in young children. American Educator, 22, 32-39.
- Torgesen, J.K., Alexander, A.W., Wagner, R.K., Rashotte, C.A., Voeller, K., Conway, T. & Rose, E. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34, 33-58.
- Torgesen, J.K., & Burgess, S.R. (1998). Consistency of reading-related phonological processes throughout early childhood: Evidence from longitudinal-correlational and instructional studies. In J. Metsala & L. Ehri (Eds.). Word Recognition in Beginning Reading, 161-188. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Torgesen, J.K., Rashotte, C., Alexander, A., & MacPhee, K. (2002). Progress toward understanding the conditions that are required to remediate reading difficulties in older children. Invited address to conference titled, "Effective preventions and interventions for children at-risk of reading difficulties or with identified reading disabilities." Sponsored by the National Dyslexia Research Foundation, Kohala Coast, Hawaii, June.
- Wagner, R.K., Torgesen, J.K., Rashotte, C.A., Hecht, S.A., Barker, T.A., Burgess, S.R., Donahue, J., & Garon, T. (1997). Changing causal relations between phonological processing abilities and word-level reading as children develop from beginning to fluent readers: A five-year longitudinal study. Developmental Psychology, 33, 468-479.

### About the Author

Dr. Rosemary Papalewis is currently a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Sacramento. She also serves as the Director of the University's Center for Teaching and Learning. Prior to coming to CSUS, she has held positions as the Western Region Vice President and National Teacher Expert for Sylvan Learning Systems, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Inter-Institutional Relations for the California State University System, and Professor and Co-Founding Director for the Joint Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at CSU Fresno, and was a Chief Administrator and principal of several private schools in Nebraska. She began her career in education as a middle school teacher in the Los Angeles area. In addition to numerous research publications and presentations, she is the lead author of a recent published (Corwin Press) book titled Leadership on Purpose: Promising Practices for African-American and Hispanic Students.

Copyright of Reading Improvement is the property of Project Innovation, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.